



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,571	01/26/2001	Ahmad Tawil	016295.0635	7613
7590 06/14/2004 Khannan Suntharam Baker Botts L.L.P. One Shell Plaza 910 Louisiana Street Houston, TX 77002-4995			EXAMINER LEE, PHILIP C	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER 6
DATE MAILED: 06/14/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/770,571

Applicant(s)

TAWIL ET AL.

Examiner

Philip C Lee

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/18/01.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4 and 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-34 are presented for examination.
2. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in the specification and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112*

3. Claims 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms lack proper antecedent basis:
  - i. the port login – claims 9-22.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 23-25, 27-31 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunlock, U.S. Patent 6,606,630 (hereinafter Gunlock) in view of Saegusa, U.S. Patent 6,745,281 (hereinafter Saegusa).

6. As per claims 1, 23 and 29, Gunlock taught the invention substantially as claimed comprising:

a high speed network interconnect (col. 6, lines 17-26; fig. 1) ;

one or more target devices coupled to the high speed network interconnect,

wherein each target device has a unique hardware address (fig. 1; col. 6, lines 17-26; col. 8, lines 13-25);

a host, wherein the host comprises a host bus adapter (HBA) operable to perform a port login with a target device (col. 4, lines 58-63; col. 6, lines 32-48; col. 8, lines 25-27); and

a unique hardware address table stored in a memory (col. 6, lines 40-43), wherein the unique hardware address table stores the unique hardware address of every target device (col. 9, lines 54-62; col. 8, lines 13-27).

7. Gunlock did not teach not performing a port login with a target device unless the unique hardware address is present on the unique hardware address table. Saegusa taught the host is authorized to access such that the HBA will not perform a port login with a target device unless the unique hardware address of that target device is present on the unique hardware address table (col. 14, lines 1-45; col. 11, lines 51-57).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gunlock and Saegusa because Saegusa's teaching of authorized access table would increase the security of Gunlock's system by allowing only the authorized host to access the target devices.

9. As per claims 2, 24 and 30, Gunlock and Saegusa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 23 and 29 above. Gunlock further taught wherein the unique hardware address is a port name (col. 8, lines 21-25).

10. As per claims 3, 25 and 31, Gunlock and Saegusa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 23 and 29 above. Gunlock further taught wherein the unique hardware address is a node name (col. 8, lines 21-25).

11. As per claims 5, 27 and 33, Gunlock and Saegusa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 23 and 29 above. Gunlock further taught wherein the target device is a storage device (col. 6, lines 17-24; col. 7, lines 19-20).

12. As per claims 6, 28 and 34, Gunlock and Saegusa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 23 and 29 above. Gunlock further taught wherein the HBA comprises the memory (col. 6, lines 40-43).

13. As per claims 7 and 8, Gunlock and Saegusa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Gunlock further taught wherein the high speed network interconnect is a high speed optical network interconnect (col. 6, lines 17-21).

14. Claims 4, 9-22, 26 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunlock and Saegusa in view of Blumenau et al, U.S. Patent 6,665,714 (hereinafter Blumenau).

15. As per claims 4, 26 and 32, Gunlock and Saegusa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 23 and 29 above. Gunlock and Saegusa did not teach using a World-Wide Name. Blumenau taught wherein the unique hardware address is a World-Wide Name (col. 6, lines 65-67; col. 22, lines 4-11).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gunlock, Saegusa and Blumenau because Blumenau's teaching of World-Wide Name would enhance Gunlock's and Saegusa's systems by providing a unique identification for identifying each storage device (col. 22, lines 7-11).

17. As per claim 9, Gunlock taught the invention substantially as claimed for managing the port login performed by a host bus adapter (HBA) for a host that is communicatively coupled to a fabric, wherein one or more target devices, each having a unique hardware address, are coupled to the fabric (fig. 1, lines 17-26; col. 8, lines 13-25) comprising:

determining whether the unique hardware address of an available target device is present on a unique hardware address table, wherein the unique hardware address table contains the unique hardware addresses of each target device (col. 8, lines 13-27).

18. Gunlock did not teach performing a port login based on the authorized access table. Saegusa taught the host is authorized to access such that the HBA will not perform a port login with a target device unless the unique hardware address of that target device is present on the unique hardware address table (col. 14, lines 1-45; col. 11, lines 51-57). Saegusa further taught performing a port login with each target device whose unique hardware address is present on the unique hardware address table (col. 14, lines 1-54).

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gunlock and Saegusa because Saegusa's teaching of

authorized access table would increase the security of Gunlock's system by allowing only the authorized host to access the target devices.

20. Gunlock and Saegusa did not teach querying for available target devices. Blumenau taught querying the fabric for available target devices (col. 6, lines 62-65; col. 21, lines 67-col. 22, lines 14).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gunlock, Saegusa and Blumenau because Blumenau's method of querying the fabric for available target devices would increase the efficiency of Gunlock's and Saegusa's systems by avoiding login attempt to unavailable target devices by the host.

22. As per claim 16, Gunlock taught the invention substantially as claimed for managing the port login performed by a host bus adapter (HBA) for a host that is communicatively coupled to a fabric, wherein one or more target devices, each having a unique hardware address, are coupled to the fabric (fig. 1, lines 17-26; col. 8, lines 13-25); comprising the steps of:

storing the unique hardware address of the selected target devices to a unique hardware address access table (col. 4, lines 58-63; col. 6, lines 40-43; col. 8, lines 13-25).

23. Gunlock did not teach selecting target devices and not performing a port login with a target device unless the unique hardware address is present on the unique hardware address table.



Saegusa taught selecting target devices that may be accessed by the host (col. 14, lines 1-6) and the HBA will not perform a port login with a target device unless the unique hardware address of that target device is present on the unique hardware address table (col. 14, lines 1-45; col. 11, lines 51-57).

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gunlock and Saegusa because Saegusa's teaching of authorized access table would increase the security of Gunlock's system by allowing only the authorized host to access the target devices.

25. Gunlock and Saegusa did not teach querying for available target devices. Blumenau taught querying the fabric for available target devices (col. 6, lines 62-65; col. 21, lines 67-col. 22, lines 14).

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gunlock, Saegusa and Blumenau because Blumenau's method of querying the fabric for available target devices would increase the efficiency of Gunlock's and Saegusa's systems by avoiding login attempt to unavailable target devices by the host.

27. As per claims 10 and 17, Gunlock, Saegusa and Blumenau taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 9 and 16 above. Gunlock further taught wherein the unique hardware address is a port name (col. 8, lines 21-25).

28. As per claims 11 and 18, Gunlock, Saegusa and Blumenau taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 9 and 16 above. Gunlock further taught wherein the unique hardware address is a node name (col. 8, lines 21-25).

29. As per claims 12 and 19, Gunlock, Saegusa and Blumenau taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 9 and 16 above. Blumenau further taught wherein the unique hardware address is a World-Wide Name (col. 6, lines 65-67; col. 22, lines 4-11).

30. As per claims 13 and 20, Gunlock, Saegusa and Blumenau taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 9 and 16 above. Gunlock further taught wherein the target device is a storage device (col. 6, lines 17-24; col. 7, lines 19-20).

31. As per claims 14 and 21, Gunlock, Saegusa and Blumenau taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 9 and 16 above. Gunlock further taught wherein the HBA comprises the memory (col. 6, lines 40-43).

32. As per claims 15 and 22, Gunlock, Saegusa and Blumenau taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 9 and 16 above. Gunlock further taught wherein the high speed network interconnect is a high speed optical network interconnect (col. 6, lines 17-21).

### CONCLUSION

33. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hubis et al, U.S. Patent 6,343,324, disclosed a method of granting access to a device based on a data structure.


34. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (703)305-7721. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday.

36. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

37. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)350-6121.

P.L.



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100